<u>**Kentucky Adult Education Advisory Committee**</u>
Minutes
June 20, 2008

Members in attendance: S.J. Brennan, Cris Crowley, Joan Flanery, Veronica Gayle, Kathryn Hardman, Renae Harrison, Karen McLeod, Peg Russell and Julie Scoskie.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Sarah Hawker welcomed members and introduced Dr. Richard Crofts, the new Interim President of the Council on Postsecondary Education.

Dr. Crofts discussed his first days with the Council, provided information on his work and education background and reiterated the importance of adult education to the Council on Postsecondary Education's mission.

Sarah Hawker noted the focus of the meeting was the culmination of a year and a half of work. As the agency implemented the New Framework for Adult Education, all policies were reviewed and adjusted to support the new policy direction. The Enrollment and Outcomes Workgroup, led by Reecie Stagnolia, focused attention onto the program performance and incentive policies. In addition to working with KYAE staff, the work group spent a day with an outside focus group, which included some advisory committee members, to get input and feedback. The workgroup will now present the plan to the KYAE advisory group, our top-level advisory committee, for comment and feedback.

Before getting into that agenda item, Ms. Hawker discussed the recent RFP process. A lot was learned on both sides on the development, writing of and review of proposals. As indicated, this was a required competitive process that was delayed as long as possible. She noted, there was some consternation from the field, since it had been several years since a competition was held and due to staff turnover, not all local staff had the historical perspective of going through a competition. KYAE originally received 122 proposals for 120 county programs. Thirty-two counties went out for re-bid, which caused some undue consternation. The last time KYAE held a competition there were 29 counties that were advertised for re-bid. There were five changes in fiscal agents, but for four of the programs, the current provider elected not to submit a proposal. The only change due to competition is Bracken County is being transitioned to Maysville Community and Technical College. We've heard from Bracken County for Literacy Council staff and Bill Teegarden at Maysville Community and Technical College and things are going well with regards to preparing for the transition. We hope they continue to work together to build a strong program.

Ms. Hawker noted some things filtered up to KYAE that she would like to address with the committee and the field at an opportune time. Competition was necessary. The re-bid process wasn't a crisis. It wasn't personal. KYAE staffed worked very hard to be as impersonal as possible. It wasn't punitive or arbitrary on our part. The same pressure the local level feels from KYAE regarding reporting and performance has a trickle up effect. KYAE is the middleman.

KYAE has worked to fine-tune technical assistance so that we can provide targeted technical assistance help instead of routine assistance and hopes the field will see the technical assistance as an effort to assist and make every program stronger which will help us enable students to achieve more.

Kathryn Hardman suggested KYAE do a session outlining common errors before the next competition is held, so that everyone can learn from the experience of the 32 counties that had to be re-bid.

Ms. Hawker noted the timing for the next competition hinges on WIA reauthorization. She commended Janet Hoover who has worked on the process since last November. She noted many have told us that this was the finest and easiest RFP to follow that many have responded to and she thanked Janet for her work.

Janet Hoover thanked members for comments and compliments, but she acknowledged that anything can be improved and asked members to continue providing comments and feedback.

Julie Scoskie noted that KYAE has been very open to receiving feedback. The Kentucky Association of Adult and Continuing Education (KAACE) conducted a survey regarding the RFP process. She noted board members talked to a lot of counties and generally found if staff addressed everything in the RFP, they did OK. She noted that KAACE provided a grant-writing workshop. She noted the once the RFP has been advertised, KYAE has to be very careful to be impartial and are not allowed to offer advice, but suggested that was a role that KAACE could help provide. She noted some programs asked if KAACE board members could review the application as an objective third party.

Ms. Hawker noted that KYAE is looking forward to receiving the results of the KAACE survey. It will be another great piece of information that we can use to improve future RFP processes.

Cris Crowley asked if KYAE would identify the best grant applications and allow other programs to review them. She noted that she didn't get 100 points in all categories and wanted to know what was missed or what could have been said better.

Ms. Hardman noted it was helpful getting points back. Ms. Crowley added that the points gave her information that something was lacking, but they didn't help her to identify specifically what was missing.

Ms. Hawker noted, we have heard some folks are reluctant to call KYAE. She encouraged local programs to call KYAE staff for assistance. A large part of the job of administration is ensuring success. KYAE staff have been configured to best align with local needs. We need to get the message out to the field that there is no negative perception to call anyone on this staff. We want an open, helpful relationship. While we have to set policies, since federal and state authorities trust us to oversee funds, it is not an adversarial relationship. It is a collaborative, open one. We can't do it without you.

She encouraged members to e-mail Janet Hoover with any further thoughts about the RFP process.

Lastly, Ms. Hawker reported that KYAE is losing two staff to retirement -- Janet Hoover and Sandy Kestner. She publicly thanked both for their contributions to KYAE and noted they will be sorely missed.

Today we have focused the agenda in two parts – Performance Funding Model and Program Accountability and Support System.

Performance Funding Model

Reecie Stagnolia encouraged open dialogue. He recognized the work group team members – D.J. Begley, Billy Crabtree, Marilyn Lyons, Terry Pruitt, Terry Tackett, David Walters and Melissa Wireman. He noted the group has involved some of the brightest thinkers and best challengers he has worked with and all have come to the table with different strengths and skills. It is a privilege to be a part of the team, which has allowed him to be the team spokesman.

He recognized committee members who were involved in the focus group meeting – Julie Scoskie, Renae Harrison, Kathryn Hardman, Cris Crowley and Vicki Boyd. The focus group also included Bill Bates, Jim Porter and Susan Jackson.

As the workgroup has reached the culmination of its work, they are seeking constructive feedback. He encouraged members to think holistically and systemically and to set aside individual program concerns.

As we continue to build upon the New Framework for Adult Education, over the past 18 months, the team has worked in phases, including checkpoints with the KYAE Leadership Team. Phase one redefined what constitutes an enrollment. Phase two focused on the performance funding methodology. Phase three focused on accountability.

As we worked, we had some key tenants.
- Keep it simple so that we can easily convey the message.
- Use similar terms in both the performance and accountability models.
- As with the Framework, focus around a guiding principal that Kentucky's core business is to raise the educational levels of eligible adults.

In addition to the guiding principle, we have governing principles that relate to state and federal accountability.

The Kentucky Adult Education Act of 2000, Senate Bill 1 mandates that we have "an efficient, responsive, and coordinated system of providers that delivers educational services to all adult citizens in quantities and of a quality that is comparable to the national average or above and significantly elevates the level of education of the adults of the Commonwealth" or as the team has come to paraphrase, we need to move the educational needle.

The Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, Title II of the Workforce Investment Act outlines core indicators of performance "demonstrated improvements in literacy skill levels in reading, writing, and speaking the English language, numeracy… Placement in, retention in, or completion of, postsecondary education… Receipt of a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent."

Quality and accountability are important as we talk about balance in program services.

At the Council level, KYAE has accountability goals of GED$_®$ production and transitioning adult education students to postsecondary education. This is an example of the trickle up accountability of which Ms. Hawker spoke earlier.

There are twelve primary considerations outlined in WIA that federal law says must be included in applications for funding.
  (1) the degree to which the eligible provider will establish measurable goals for participant outcomes;

(2)   the past effectiveness of an eligible provider in improving the literacy skills of adults and families, and, after the one-year period beginning with the adoption of an eligible agency's performance measures, the success of an eligible provider receiving funding under this subtitle in meeting or exceeding such performance measures, especially with respect to those adults with the lowest levels of literacy;

(3)   the commitment of the eligible provider to serve individuals in the community who are most in need of literacy services, including individuals who are low-income or have minimal literacy skills;

(4)   whether or not the program--
   A. is of sufficient intensity and duration for participants to achieve substantial learning gains; and
   B. uses instructional practices, such as phonemic awareness, systematic phonics, fluency, and reading comprehension that research has proven to be effective in teaching individuals to read;

(5)   whether the activities are built on a strong foundation of research and effective educational practice;

(6)   whether the activities effectively employ advances in technology, as appropriate, including the use of computers;

(7)   whether the activities provide learning in real life contexts to ensure that an individual has the skills needed to compete in the workplace and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship;

(8)   whether the activities are staffed by well-trained instructors, counselors, and administrators;

(9)   whether the activities coordinate with other available resources in the community, such as by establishing strong links with elementary schools and secondary schools, postsecondary educational institutions, one-stop centers, job training programs, and social service agencies;

(10) whether the activities offer flexible schedules and support services (such as child care and transportation) that are necessary to enable individuals, including individuals with disabilities or other special needs, to attend and complete programs;

(11) whether the activities maintain a high-quality information management system that has the capacity to report participant outcomes and to monitor program performance against the eligible agency performance measures; and

(12) whether the local communities have a demonstrated need for additional English literacy programs.

From the Adult Education Pipeline, we see that inputs are a means to an end. We want the end result. How do we plug the holes and stop chasing enrollments? We want to have a singular focus on outcomes, for we believe if you focus on desired outcomes, other things will fall into place.

As we look at updated data for the Adult Education Data Analysis chart from the Framework document, we are encouraged by some upward trends in GED production and enrollments for 12+ hours. The national average hours of instruction is 107; we still average about half of that.

It's helpful to take a look back at where we were when reform came into place. We had 51,177 enrolled. Of those, 37,000 had 12+ hours of instruction (72% of total enrolled). For the most recent year, the percentage is opposite. We had 27% of total enrollments with 12+ hours of instruction.

In FY 2007-08, we had a statewide enrollment goal of 70,000 with a performance goal of 70% of measures. Enrollments were defined as students assessed and enrolled in adult literacy, adult basic education, GED prep/ASE, family literacy, ESL, workplace education funded through the core services grant, and corrections count toward the county's enrollment goal. In addition, a student whose only service is taking the OPT counts toward the county's enrollment. Also a student

receiving targeted instruction and taking the Kentucky Paraeducator Assessment counts toward the county's enrollment. In the FY 2007-08 model, a county could earn between 7%-10% of the Core Services funding. In the new performance model, a program can earn up to 13%. The new model equally rewards performance on all measures.

Key definitions in the new model:
- Enrollment - a student assessed and enrolled 12 hours or more in adult literacy, adult basic education, GED prep/ASE, corrections, family literacy, ESL, workplace education funded through the core services grant.
- Academic Performance - the percent of enrolled students completing educational levels.
- Performance Measures - 11 educational levels plus GED and Transitioning to Postsecondary Education.
- Program Performance Funding - 1% for each performance measure attained (13 possible).
- Student Performance Funding - programs will be able to earn funding for KYAE-approved student outcomes.

Program performance consists of enrollment, academic performance and performance measures. We have three categories of Program Performance: Excellence, Proficient, and Needs Improvement; we see Proficient as good.

Mr. Stagnolia noted as we move through the slides, anything highlighted reflects changes to the model that have been made since the focus group meeting.

The Enrollment categories were adjusted following input from the focus group. Excellence is defined as greater than or equal to 90 percent. Proficient is 70 to 89 percent. Needs Improvement is less than 70 percent. When using the state's 2008 enrollment goal of 70,000 as an example, 63,000 would need to be achieved in order to be in the Excellence category,

For Academic Performance (students in NRS levels), the Excellence category is greater than or equal to 53 percent. The Proficient category is 45 to 52 percent. The Needs Improvement category is less than 45 percent.

Programs achieving excellence in Enrollment and Academic Performance are eligible to receive program performance funding based on meeting or exceeding each Performance Measure. All Performance Measures are valued equally (1 percent). Programs may earn up to 13 percent (1 percent per measure achieved). The performance measures include the 11 educational levels plus entering postsecondary education or training and earning a GED diploma. Placement in employment and retention in employment are not counted because of a lag in the data match. This model incents and rewards programs. It is not a funding mechanism.

KYAE has budgeted up to $1 million for program performance funding, not to exceed 13 percent of Core Services funding for FY 2008-09. If overall program performance exceeds $1 million, funds will be distributed proportionally.

Academic performance is calculated as the sum of students completing an educational level divided by the sum of the students enrolled in educational levels (excluding high adult secondary education).

We have redesigned the performance report in AERIN. The 13 performance measures are displayed in blue. Academic performance has been added to the report. Educational level completions have been added to the report. We are using new terms -- "actual" and "achieved" – on the performance reports.

Student Performance

Student Performance Categories
- Educational Level Completions (multiple) – one point
- GED Graduates
    - < 2700 score – three points
    - ≥ 2700 score – four points
- GED Graduates Transitioning to Postsecondary Education – three points
- Adult Education Students Transitioning to Postsecondary (not counted in above category) – one point
- Kentucky Employability Certification (KEC)/Kentucky Manufacturing Skills Standard (KMSS) – one point
- Family Literacy (Educational Level Completion or GED + facilitated/un-facilitated PACT and Parenting) – one point

Following recommendations at the focus group meeting, KYAE lowered the GED Graduates' score from 2950 to 2700, since 2700 corresponds to the score needed to apply for the Byrd Scholarship, and KYAE added the category of students transitioning to postsecondary education that are not counted in the GED graduates transitioning to postsecondary education.

Multiple level completions is a new category on the Performance Report. Multiple level completions are defined to include level completions in math, reading and language not just the subject the student is enrolled. However, the student must complete the initial educational level before completions in other educational levels will be counted for student performance funding.

For FY 2007-08, a multiple level completion is defined as a student making more than one level gain in one subject. The total educational level gains possible per student is four.

For FY 2008-09, a student enrolled in one subject making multiple levels gains in reading, math and or language can earn up to 14; a student enrolled in two subjects making multiple level gains in reading, math and or language can earn up to 13 points; a student enrolled in three subjects and making multiple level gains in reading, math and or language can earn up to 12 points. For FY 2008-09, the total educational level gains possible ranges from 12-14 per student depending on how the student is enrolled in AERIN.

The same applies for ESL multiple level gains as above with adult basic education and adult secondary education except:
- For FY 2007-08, there are up to five possible level gains per ESL student that enrolls in Reading or Listening. For an ESL student enrolled in Writing, up to four level gains are possible.
- For FY 2008-09, there are up to 16 possible level gains per ESL student.

Mr. Stagnolia reviewed a statewide student performance funding scenario. KYAE Performance is the total number of student outcomes in each performance category at the end of the fiscal year. The total student outcomes divided by the total student performance dollars budgeted equals the dollar value for each point, thus the total number of student outcomes determines the amount of money each point it worth. Meaning if programs produce more, the value of each point will decrease proportionally.

A county's student performance funding is calculated by multiplying the county's student performance points by the state point value.

To qualify for Student Performance Funding in FY2008-09, a program must be in the proficient or excellence categories. Beginning in FY2008-09, performance funds will be distributed based on student outcomes for programs in Proficient or Excellence categories.

Ms. Hardman asked where KYAE gets the data for the adult education students transitioning to postsecondary education. Marilyn Lyons indicated is it via data match.

Ms. Scoskie asked if a local program knows a student is not included in the data match with public postsecondary institutions, will there be a way to secure documentation to have them included. Mr. Stagnolia indicated KYAE would explore a partnership and possible data match with the Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities to see if we could document transitions to independent colleges and universities.

Ms. Hardman requested an electronic copy of the PowerPoint presentation so that she could have a staff meeting and review the model with all staff. KYAE declined for now. KYAE prefers to rollout the model statewide as we did with the New Framework for Adult Education.

Ms. Hardman asked if KYAE could offer a commitment of when the goal numbers for next year would be available. She noted it is helpful for staff to know exactly what they need to focus on to achieve the goals and the earlier the better. Mr. Stagnolia noted the enrollment goal has yet to be determined, and we cannot give a firm date on when it will be set. We need to carefully analyze the data after we complete this year to determine a reasonable goal. If we finish the year much lower than 70,000, it would lead us to ask if 70,000 is a reasonable goal. The enrollment goal must be reasonable and attainable, but it must be hard to achieve in order to have a good balance. Being reasonable allows you to focus on the right thing and will produce outcomes.

Ms. Scoskie noted the Kentucky Community and Technical College System is changing the ACT cut scores, so she is expecting an influx of people coming into adult education. If she approaches it from a business perspective, the student performance funding model focuses more attention on GED production than transitions; however it is just as important when people successfully transition into postsecondary education. She added, if adult education helps the student get into college, does it matter if they earned a GED diploma or if they already had a high school diploma when they came into adult education? Joan Flanery and Kathryn Hardman agreed.

Ms. Crowley noted the GED diploma is the foundation of what adult education gives students to help them transition not only to postsecondary education but also to life. She added that postsecondary education may not be on the radar for a student initially, but part of adult education's role is to help them see what they can achieve.

Mr. Stagnolia reminded members that points are also possible for each of the academic performance levels plus the GED diploma.

Ms. Hawker noted that KYAE had discussed internally about how to work with this group and acknowledge adult education's participation in helping them transition to postsecondary education; however, at this time, the GED recipient transitioning to postsecondary education is the state goal.

A possible dilemma was noted. We want to help people achieve their goals as quickly as possible. For many students, earning a GED diploma is the immediate goal, and they have no intention of going onto college. However, the student performance model awards more points for a higher GED score.

Ms. Hawker noted students might need a GED with higher score for employment purposes, not simply to qualify for the Byrd scholarship. A higher score doesn't simply indicate the student is better prepared for college, but has a better grasp of subject matter content, thus ultimately preparing them better for life.

Julie Scoskie questioned if high scoring GED students score higher due to instructional time and services received or if they simply entered the adult education program functioning at a higher level.

Ms. Crowley noted following the focus group meeting, she checked GED statistics for her county. Out of 81 GED diplomas earned as of May 2008, 35 would have been in the 2700 or better range, and all of them had 12+ hours of instruction. Ironically, she noted, ten of them were in corrections.

Veronica Gayle asked about transitions to work. Is KYAE considering including that as a student point? Mr. Stagnolia noted a by-product of work and the alignment of data does not give us the ability to perform a data match in a timely manner, so we are not able to award performance funds for transitioning to work. Ms. Lyons pointed out that in order to reward efforts in helping prepare adult education students for work, we have included points for earning a KMSS or KEC.

Ms. Scoskie noted that GED graduates are coming in scoring lower and lower. Ms. Lyons acknowledged that is the trend with younger clients.

Karen McLeod asked for clarification for FY 2008-09 if there is a linkage between the enrollment goal and student performance funding. Mr. Stagnolia indicated there is a linkage between the two for FY 2008-09, since a program must be in the proficient or excellence category in enrollment to qualify for student performance funding. This year, if a program doesn't meet the program performance goal, they still may qualify for student performance funds.

Other Business

Since there isn't sufficient time to cover the program accountability and support model before lunch, Ms. Hawker asked members for suggestions of things they would like to have covered at a Program Directors' Leadership Institute that KYAE is planning.

Members agreed they would like to hear about new and innovative practices that have come out of the New Framework in addition to best practices. It was suggested to have a poster session or possibly booths set up with handouts and other materials available and include contact information for follow-up discussions.

Suggested session topics included orientation, math curricula and use of instructional technology.

Ms. Hawker asked members to write down thoughts and ideas on the provided form and to give it to Sandy Kestner before leaving.

Program Accountability and Support System

Mr. Stagnolia noted you would see common terminology used for program performance, student performance and program accountability and support.
- Excellence is defined as a program performing in excellence in both enrollment and academic performance.
- Proficient is defined as performing in proficient or higher enrollment and academic performance.

- Needs Improvement is defined as a program in needs improvement in either enrollment or academic performance.

A program performing in Needs Improvement in either enrollment or academic performance for one year will be provided additional program support by the KYAE Program Support Associate.

A program performing in Needs Improvement in either enrollment or academic performance for two years will be placed on probation and provided intensive program support by a KYAE Team.

A program performing in Needs Improvement in either enrollment or academic performance for three consecutive years will result in contract termination. We believe what we unveil relating to program support will wrap around you to give you the support you need so that you'll never get to this point. That is our hope and our goal.

A program performing in Needs Improvement in both enrollment and academic performance for one year will be placed on probation and provided intensive program support by a KYAE Team.

A program performing in Needs Improvement for two years in both enrollment and academic performance will result in contract termination.

Program Support Levels
- Program Support is an ongoing process and is the regular year-around support provided by the program support associate.
- Additional Program Support includes the senior associate for program support in addition to the program support associate.
- Intensive Program Support involves the program support associate, senior associate and other KYAE staff with expertise in the needed areas.

Program status is determined by AERIN year-end performance data. All programs will receive program status notification in one of the performance categories: Excellence, Proficient or Needs Improvement (less than 70 percent of enrollment goal and/or less than 45 percent of students completing educational levels).

Program Support for programs in Needs Improvement will be based upon steps that create a cycle of continuous improvement. The steps are:
- Analysis – based upon AERIN program data and program self review;
- Diagnosis – based upon program performance Analysis and program visits with director;
- Prescription – based upon Diagnosis and determined by severity of diagnosis (minimal, minor or major); and
- Follow-up – follow-up to program evaluating initial Prescription results which creates a continuous feedback loop identifying further program analyses, diagnoses, prescriptions and evaluations needs (desk reviews and visits).

Before proceeding further into the accountability and support model, Ms. Hawker asked if further discussion was needed on the program and student performance model.

There was additional discussion of the division of points available based upon GED scores. While some members felt it would be better not to give a higher point value for a higher GED score, since research doesn't prove that higher GED scores result in successful transitions to postsecondary education, Ms. Hawker noted there are those who use the GED not just for postsecondary education. What does a higher score mean to the person not entering postsecondary education? It would lead the person to being better prepared for work and life.

B.J. Helton noted that the Byrd Scholarship is one of only a few scholarships available to GED graduates and the minimum score to qualify for the Byrd Scholarship is 2700.

Ms. Scoskie asked if we would be creating a system of unintended consequences? If someone comes in to just get a GED diploma, would a program hold them back to work with them further in order to achieve the higher score and thus the extra point?

Ms. Hardman indicated she didn't see a program holding back someone from testing in order to get one additional point. She noted a higher score means you have a better grasp on the subject matter. Laurel County already pays the test fee for high OPT scores.

It was asked if there was a way to identify a pattern in remedial education. Is there a way to determine if a student achieved a 410 in math whether they would be in developmental math? In discussion it was noted some with a 610 in math are in developmental math. At this time there is no research to identify a trend, but generally, the feeling is there is no trend.

Ms. Flanery noted an increasing number of people are coming into adult education to raise ACT and COMPASS scores. Is that something that could be tracked? Is there a possibility of it being considered for performance? It has more relevance of preparing individuals for college.

Ms. Hawker noted we keep coming back to our joint need to have quality in our system. If quality equates to learning, one of our indicators of better education is the composite score. It is the broad picture of the person – not broken down as to whether the person entered remedial education.

Ms. Hardman asked for clarification on what constitutes Intensive Program Support. David Walters noted regular program support is the usual and customary support provided by the associate. Additional Support means the associate and senior associate analyze program data and visit the program so that we get to know about other things going on in the county that may not be reflected in the data, such as looking at how the program is set up, professional development, program design, etc. He noted that we aren't miracle workers, we create a plan together. My folks know the administrative and policy side, you know the instructional side.

Intensive Program Support means we access other folks to serve on a team. For example, if it were a data entry problem, we would pull in Terry Tackett or Tammy Powers to provide additional AERIN Training. We will wrap as much support around you as possible. We want to be pro-active with program support, because we don't want a program to fall into a needs improvement category.

The Program Support team is still working on some of the details of the plan. There may be similarities among programs, but each county is different, so we will not have a cookie cutter approach to program support.

Ms. Crowley asked if there was a step missing in the Program Support cycle. If Hopkins and Muhlenberg counties had a problem, KYAE helps analyze the situation, diagnose the problem, and works together to create a plan (prescription) to know what is needed, but where can the counties get assistance in implementation? How do they stop doing what isn't working and start following the new plan. As an analogy, if she receives a prescription from a physician, but doesn't know how to take the medicine or simply doesn't take the medicine, the prescription won't work. She added, if I knew how to do it, wouldn't I have already done it?

Ms. Crowley asked if a program not in needs improvement could request additional technical assistance in order to be pro-active. Mr. Walters indicated we are working on delivering pro-active program support.

Mr. Stagnolia noted that every time the team has met with internal and external groups, there was good feedback, and the model was improved. He thanked members for input and discussion. He noted we have talked about the need to get back into the game of earning WIA incentive funds, but we also want to get back in the game of helping all of our students reach goals. It requires a willingness to change. Jack Welch said, "When the rate of change is greater on the outside than it is on the inside, the end is in sight."

It is important to note that we're coming to an internal decision to change the adult education system rather than changing based on an outside mandate. He added that KYAE is happy to continue to talk about this and any other issues.

Ms. McLeod asked if she could use the example in the PowerPoint presentation to estimate performance funds. At this point, Mr. Stagnolia noted, we do not have final performance data, so we do not know what a point will be worth. The chart will be updated after we have year-end date.

Ms. McLeod asked if funding is tied to enrollment. Mr. Stagnolia confirmed that for FY 2007-08 it will not be tied to enrollment, but for FY 2008-09, it will be tied to enrollment.

Other Discussion

Ms. Scoskie asked if KYAE had any plans for another statewide marketing campaign.

Ms Hawker noted KYAE is part of a larger project at CPE. The group met last week to determine the best use of our portion of the marketing plans.

Ms. Scoskie noted she has lots of ideas and supporting data. She noted the marketing campaign makes a huge difference in numbers coming through the doors and it helps much more to have the major effort in August.

Ms. McLeod agreed the statewide marketing campaign had a measurable impact.

Ms. Hardman suggested having a branded message and sustained campaign of print, radio and television to reiterate the message.

Ms. Hoover noted the obvious impediment to broadcast marketing is cost. For a four-week television and radio campaign, it costs $1-2 million.

It was noted that radio advertisement is cheaper than television and has a broader reach especially in rural areas of the state and those who do not have local Kentucky television stations.

Ms. McLeod discussed a session attended at the recent COABE conference in which Virginia had a marketing campaign targeted to young people done by text messaging.

Other suggestions included pod casts and advertising on Face Book and You Tube.

Ms. Flanery reported that her program collaborated with a West Virginia program to advertise adult education services in the area, using the GED escalator spots.

When noted little mention of print advertising, it was agreed that since print media is cheaper, local programs can handle locally, but programs need the state to help with broader campaigns.

Ms. Hawker noted due to recent budget cuts and increased testing costs, some GED Testing Centers are struggling to continue operation. Since testing centers exist on GED receipts, KYAE is looking at policy changes to help make centers financially viable. Dr. Helton noted that a major cost for testing centers is the examiner salary, which is expected when you consider the length of the tests and the minimum educational requirement of a bachelor's degree. KYAE has surveyed other states and is currently surveying Kentucky Testing Centers to get a clearer financial picture so that we can determine if other measures will be needed to ensure ample testing locations throughout the state.

Members thanked KYAE for absorbing the latest budget cut at the state level rather than passing it on to local programs. Ms. Hawker noted that it took a lot of work by Terry Pruitt and Reecie Stagnolia and will result in delaying or scaling back some state projects, but our goal is to provide as much support to programs as possible during these tough budget times.

Expense Vouchers

Members were asked to sign expense vouchers.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is September 5, 2008.

Addendum to Minutes

The September 5, 2008 meeting was cancelled. The next meeting is December 12, 2008.